

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 92, 93, 103, and 104 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claim 1 of GOSS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,815). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By way of the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 92 and 103 to improve form and adds new claim 113-119. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 92, 93, 103, 104, and 113-119 are pending.

**Double patenting rejection**

Claims 92, 93, 103, and 104 stand rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claim 1 of GOSS et al.

While not acquiescing in this rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, Applicants submit a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 92, 93, 103, and 104 be withdrawn.

Therefore, claims 92 and 103, along with their respective dependent claims 93 and 104 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of pending claims 92, 93, 103 and 104 is respectfully requested.

*New Claims*

New claims 113-115 depend from claim 92. Therefore, claims 113-115 are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 92.

New claims 116-119 depend from claim 103. Therefore, claims 116-119 are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 103.

*Conclusion*

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions or requirements in the future.

Application Serial No. 10/648,427  
Attorney Docket No. COS97080C1

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, L.L.P.

By: /David D. Nelson, Reg. No. 47818/  
David D. Nelson  
Registration No. 47,818

Date: August 18, 2009

11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 25537

Attachment: Terminal Disclaimer